DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 302 24 SP 005 685

AUTHOR Poliakoff, Lorraine
TITLE Teacher Centers: An Outline of Current Information.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-8-0490
PUB DATE May 72
CONTRACT OEC-0-8-080490-3706(010)
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Consortia; *Educational Coordination; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Centers

ABSTRACT

Information for this outline on teacher centers was taken from unpublished documents, most of which were written in 1971 and 1972 under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education. The information is arranged by topic to make evident the points of agreement and disagreement among educators about teacher centers; all statements of fact or opinion are footnoted. Details are extensive to compensate for the unavailability of most of the documents. The following topics are covered: the rationale behind teacher centers; the types, functions, clientele, staffing, and financing of teacher centers; parity; USOE management of educational renewal; numbers of teacher centers; and the educational extension agent. The bibliography contains 35 items. (Author)

ED 062302

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TEACHER CENTERS: AN OUTLINE OF CURRENT INFORMATION

by Lorraine Poliakoff

Published by
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education
Number One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Sponsored by: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); Association of Teacher Educators, national affiliate of the National Education Association; Council on Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association

May 1972

SP 005 685

SP 005 685

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword iii

I. Rationale Behind Teacher Centers. 1

II. Types of Teacher Centers. 2

III. Functions of a Teacher Center 5

IV. Clientele of a Teacher Center 8

V. Parity--or the Lack of It 9

VI. USOE Management of Educational Renewal. 14

VII. Staffing a Teacher Center 14

VIII. Financing Teacher Centers 15

IX. Numbers of Teacher Centers--Present and Future 17

X. The Educational Extension Agent 21

Bibliography 25

ERIC Descriptors 29

About ERIC 30

FOREWORD

This outline of current information on educational renewal resulted from Clearinghouse participation in Subcommittee IX (Data and Information Systems) of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers. It is an illustration of how the Clearinghouse can provide direct idea and information services for key programs and studies within the U.S. Office of Education and then utilize the product for the benefit of the larger educational community. The information outlined in the paper is based on documents which are mostly fugitive in nature and which were developed primarily by individuals and groups under the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education. Originally, this paper was released as a document-by-document outline. However, as the number of documents on renewal increased, the outline was rearranged by topics of interest. Under each topic, opinions and facts found in the documents are outlined and footnoted. Contradictions in facts are sometimes evident; however, they are usually a function of the date the information was issued.

As a term, "educational renewal" is new. The precise meaning, implications, and applications are still being studied by the U.S. Office of Education, by several committees working under its direction, and by various other organizations and agencies. Obviously, however, renewal in itself is not a new concept. Whether it has been termed "in-service education" or "school-college-community-cooperation," renewal has been sought by responsible professionals who knew that a preservice teacher was only partially prepared and that this growth would have to continue under the instruction of graduate professors, administrators in the elementary-secondary schools, and professional organizations. It is therefore no surprise to find in the ERIC collection many documents, indexed under terms other than renewal, that are quite relevant to the study of the renewal concept.

You may do further research using the above descriptors by checking issues of Research in Education (RIE) and Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE). Both RIE and CIJE use the same descriptors (index terms). Documents in RIE are listed in blocks according to the clearinghouse code letters which processed them, beginning with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Education (AC) and ending with the ERIC Clearinghouse on Vocational and Technical Education (VT). The clearinghouse code letters, which are listed at the beginning of RIE, appear opposite the ED number at the beginning of each entry. "SP" (School Personnel) designates documents processed by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education.

In addition to using the ERIC Thesaurus, RIE, CIJE, and various ERIC indexes, you will find it helpful to be placed on the mailing list of the ERIC clearinghouses which are likely to abstract and index as well as develop publications pertinent to your needs and interests. The newsletters are provided on a complimentary basis on request to the individual clearinghouses.

For readers uncertain how to use ERIC capabilities effectively, we recommend the following which are available in microfiche and hardcopy through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service: (a) How To Conduct a

Search Through ERIC, ED 036 499, microfiche, 65¢; hardcopy, $3.29; (b) Instructional Materials on Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). Part Two. Information Sheets on ERIC, ED 043 580, microfiche 65¢; hardcopy, $3.29. Item "b" is available as a complimentary item, while the supply lasts, from this Clearinghouse.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education is pleased to provide this outline in the expectation that you will find it useful.

-Joel L. Burdin
Director

May 1972

TEACHER CENTERS: AN OUTLINE OF CURRENT INFORMATION

I. RATIONALE BEHIND TEACHER CENTERS
   A. David Marsh (12)* raises questions related to a rationale for teacher centers
      1. What are the social origins for legitimate needs?
      2. What historical/comparative precedents are there for teacher centers that give legitimacy to rationale?
      3. What are issues in judging adequacy of rationale for teacher centers?
   B. Dissatisfaction with present training
      1. Accomplishes goals that neither schools nor university can alone (Ad Hoc Committee, 2)
      2. Won't duplicate current university or school in-service programs as they don't prepare teachers to be better at their tasks (Tanner, 24; Tanner and Denemark, 25)
      3. Teachers are supposed to acquire basic skills from supervisors who are, however, preoccupied with other tasks (Shanker, 21)
      4. So far work of R&D centers, educational laboratories, Title III haven't had much impact on teacher and pupil performance (Shanker, 21)
      5. Effective change comes from teachers, not from their critics or supervisors (Shanker, 21)
      6. Crash program necessary to change system (Cohen, 5)
   C. Coordination of pre- and in-service teacher education (Tanner and Denemark, 25)
   D. Philosophical thoughts
      1. Educational renewal can move society from responding to participative role, can move teachers to be in touch with children and communities (Heffernan-Cabrera, 10)
      2. Educational renewal brings about change in content, training methods, and people by being flexible and sensitive (Ad Hoc Committee, 2)
   E. Origins at USOE (28)
      1. The concept of teacher centers was pursued by USOE because of the recommendation of the NDEA National Institute Steering Committee and Task Force that they do so
      2. Details
         a. The Steering Committee and Task Force were given the task of assessing long-range needs of teacher education
         b. Two years of study and research produced Teachers for the Real World and the major recommendation that a national network of training complexes be developed
         c. In response, BEPD (USOE) created the Ad Hoc National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes to discuss and review idea prior to launching series of pilot projects
         d. The Committee's recommendations are in Task Force '72 Final Report; however, they are hardly complete. What they recommend is that "a new advisory group be established to continue to develop, promote, and evaluate the concept of Training Complexes."

---

*Numbers refer to bibliographic listing

e. Through Task Force '72, brainstorm meetings have been held with about 13,000 educators. Several differences from original concept of teacher centers in Teachers for the Real World emerged from the talks.

1) Neutral territory considered unnecessary and impractical
2) Potential of center as coordinator of federal and other "outside" programs directed at improving local education systems explored
3) Potential of center as delivery system explored
4) Centers should give highest priority to teachers already in service

3. Relationship between Task Force 72's Five Thrusts and requirements of a center
   a. *Performance-based certification* provides wherewithal for output-referenced operation
   b. *Elementary Models* provide wherewithal for the following
      1) Data-dependent operation
      2) Integration of R&D with training
      3) Design and operation of output-referenced programs
      4) Use of protocol and training materials
      5) Personalization of instruction
   c. *Protocol materials* and *training materials* development provides material base
   d. *Training complex* provides structure for field work and decision making

II. TYPES OF TEACHER CENTERS
   A. David Marsh (12) raises questions about the generalizability of teacher centers
      1. What are sources of variability among teacher centers?
      2. To what extent would teacher centers within a state or region be organized into horizontal or vertical networks?
      3. What national networks of centers or support systems are needed?
      4. How would the achievement of teacher centers be disseminated?
   B. The Commissioner of Education announced in December 1971 that 200 education renewal sites will be set up (reported by Seldon and Darland, 19)
      1. No narrow Federal guidelines--local district will design program (Appendix B of Rosner Report (15) also reports that centers vary with region and educational environment.)
      2. Only requirement is that each site is to have a teacher center
   C. The Task Force '72 Final Report (26) announced that three types of pilots will operate in 1971-72: major, second level, and developmental
      1. Major has 4 models
         a. Consortium (ex.: Bay Area Teacher Center)
         b. State (ex: The Texas Educational Renewal Center) Example supplied from (6)
         c. University (ex.: Teacher Center based at the University of Rhode Island) Example supplied from (6)
         d. Local education agency (ex.: Washington, D.C., Teacher Center Example supplied from (6)
      2. Second level pilots begun in 1970 by Ad Hoc National Committee on Training Complexes (six named)

3. Developmental pilots
    a. Teacher centers to meet specific local needs
    b. Eleven of 14 named are at elementary model sites

D. The "Rosner Report" (14) discusses four types of teacher center organizations considered sensitive to cost effectiveness and local resources
    1. State-wide consortium of centers
        a. Best suited to predominately rural states with strong state departments
        b. Description
            1) Central agency, typically state department of education, coordinates support activities
            2) Certification and instruction occur in regional centers made up of schools and universities
        c. Described in Appendix G by Schalock
    2. University center
        a. University plays dominant role while coalescing with school system
        b. Described by DeVault in Appendix E
    3. School training center
        a. Best suited to major urban areas in which many large schools available to preservice and in-service teachers
        b. Description
            1) Set of exemplary schools having capability for training personnel
            2) Share training function with university
            3) Parity board oversees the operation; board has representatives from schools, university, professional teacher associations, community agencies
            4) Described by Rosner in Appendix F
    4. Technology-based individual study center
        a. Makes training programs available in remote areas and serves as shared resources among centers in an urban area
        b. Features
            1) Telecommunications network
            2) Correspondence instruction
            3) Shared-time, computer-assisted instruction
            4) On-line, real-time computer monitoring of instruction

E. Structural and functional component pilots as reported by the Ad Hoc National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes, July 1970 (2)
    1. Structural pilots
        a. Concerned with form of training complex--how to do it
        b. All scheduled for 1970-71
        c. Appalachian State University Training Complex, Paul Federoff, Director
            1) University the initiator and leader
            2) Responds to needs of rural community
            3) Rationale, purposes, design described
        d. SUNY at Stony Brook, Mortimer Kreuter, Director
            1) Focus on field associate who would link university and school to broadly based training condominium structure ("neutral ground")
            2) State departments of education and teacher association play strong roles
            3) Training complex composed of Education Houses
                a) One House serves one school district and, on a contract basis elements of surrounding districts

b) Field associates based at each House
c) Each House focuses on one problem area, such as the model school

e. Southeastern Oklahoma State College-Dallas Independent School District Training Complex, Kyle Killough, Administrator
1) School district plays leading role
2) Large structure, broadly based
3) Administrator accountable to both superintendent of schools and executive committee of Training Complex Council
4) Complex has small administrative groups and no professional teaching staff; latter comes from various institutions, especially universities

2. Functional Components Pilots
a. Concerned with specific conceptual aspects of training complexes: themes, techniques, learning outcomes
b. All schedules for 1970-71
c. Center for Training in the Emotional Aspects of Learning, University of California, Eli M. Bower, Director
1) Trains educators in connecting and restoring cognitive aspects of learning with their affective counterparts
2) Finds ways of fitting affective learnings into present educational curricula and community-sanctioned goals
3) Course descriptions detailed
d. Methods Applicable to the Training of Educators (MATE), Harold Cohen, Director, Institute of Behavioral Research
1) To train in 9 months three or four members of a junior high school in operant and behavioral design techniques and systems so that they will use them in their school
2) Courses described briefly
e. Northern Appalachia Training Center for Teachers in the Technologies, West Virginia University, Paul DeVore, Director
1) Provides brief, intensive opportunities for professional training, primarily for inservice teachers
2) Model oriented to problems, processes, and future; adaptable; individual involvement in planning
3) Assessment based on physical and human economy and efficiency
4) Assumes that some teachers missing specific "parts" of whole
5) No courses described: apparently tasks to grow out of participants' needs
f. Self Realization Development Model, Clark University, Irving Schwartz, Director
1) Studies such areas as sociology and existentialism--who am I?
2) Content of workshop described
g. Above centers seen as complementary
h. Their findings to be utilized by structural pilots

3. Recommends creation of additional functional component pilots in areas of systems and social service roles and training techniques

F. David Seldon and David Darland (20) sketch four models for teacher centers and explain why three aren't feasible
1. Teacher Centers in Britain
a. Teachers' "clubs"
1) Discussion groups
2) See new materials
3) Watch demonstrations
4) Attend seminars
5) Socialize

b. Currently 400, governed by teacher committees
c. Chief, however, is an administrator hired and paid by local education authorities
d. Works partly because the status of teachers and administrators in Britain not that different

2. Teacher Centers in Japan
   a. Teacher improvement handled through a highly centralized and bureaucratic apparatus
   b. Three grades of teaching certificates
   c. Long series of courses would be resisted by U.S. teachers
   d. Japanese are offered additional training on take-it-or-leave-it basis, but certificates have prestige
3. Decentralized bureaucratic model
   a. Run by local board with teacher advisory committee
   b. Technical improvement not in hands of teachers
   c. Initiative not with teachers
4. Autonomous model
   a. Autonomous, self-governing teacher center as non-profit corporation
   b. Charter drawn up in cooperation with representatives selected by teachers (or their bargaining agents)
   c. Advisory council of university, community, and administration representatives (if the latter are on the Board of Directors, teachers should have voting majority)
   d. Teachers in charge--parity in governance does not have practical meaning for teacher center

G. According to Saul Cohen(5), a training complex is the core of an Educational Service District
   1. Consists of about 10 schools, a university, industry, and lay representatives
   2. Every school and university would belong to a District

H. Comments by Robert F. Topp (30)
   1. Selection of permanent renewal sites may interfere with the development, application, and dissemination of better educational practices
   2. Flexibility should be built into a site selection to allow a more productive school system to be chosen at any time

I. Allen Schmieder in a draft dated May 6, 1971 (17) refers to two types of centers
   1. Those in large teacher training institutions
   2. Those in middle or large institutions and in the poverty community

III. FUNCTIONS OF A TEACHER CENTER

A. James R. Tanner (24) and David Marsh (12) ask several questions about the functions of teacher centers
   1. Should a center provide direct service with its own staff and resources or be a brokerage?
   2. Concentrate on skill training or staff development?
   3. Assume which functions of colleges, schools, etc.?
   4. Initiatory, responsive, or evaluative role in school change?
   5. Enrollees
      a. Teacher trainees?
      b. In-service teachers?
      c. Teacher educators?
      d. Variety?--to include supervisors, administrators, lay advisors, paraprofessionals, policy makers, specialists, professional organizations?
   6. Should a center promote educational renewal?

7. Should a center function as a delivery system for products of educational R&D?
8. What training models and materials would be used in the teacher center? (Includes implications of extensive amount of development of training materials at local sites, needs assessment, basis for and nature of training, and free time for training)
9. What credentials would a center be responsible for?
10. How would training relate to teacher advancement and career ladders within a school system?
11. What is a local educational renewal program? (Includes the question of teacher centers helping local schools rethink their goals)

B. Suggested functions of teacher centers (except where noted as a function of educational renewal site)
   1. Curriculum
      a. Well supplied resource base for teacher in curriculum and instructional materials (teachers reported by Woodruff, 35)
      b. Review curricula (Shanker, 21)
      c. Review, develop, use instructional materials supportive of teaching activities for which training provided (Tanner and Denemark, 25)
      d. Curricular concerns (Scruggs, 18)
      e. Some centers should develop programs and materials but should remain service-oriented (Tanner, 24)
      f. Serve as sites for field-testing new curriculum materials (Rosner, 15)
      g. Educational Renewal Site-curricular changes (Tanner and Denemark, 25; Cohen, 5; Marsh, 12)
   2. General change
      a. Creation of self-sustaining reform mechanisms (Task Force, 26)
      b. Useful for installing innovative, yet enduring mechanisms (Schmieder, 17)
      c. Training in the change process (Tanner, 24; Tanner and Denemark, 25)
      d. Encourage change (Shanker, 21)
      e. Center for innovation (teachers reported in Woodruff, 35)
      f. Educational Renewal Center--organizational change (Marsh, 12; Tanner and Denemark, 25)
   3. Dissemination
      a. Delivery of educational materials and systems from local and national sources (Consortia, 6)
      b. Each center should receive some funds for diffusion, but one or two cooperatives in each state should perform the bulk (Schalock, 16)
      c. Delivery system for educational innovation (Conference, 4; Schmieder as quoted in 6)
      d. Linked to industry for mass production and marketing of materials (Schalock, 16)
      e. Regional dissemination and diffusion networks (Schalock, 16)
      f. Delivery of education R&D efforts to public schools (March, 12)
      g. Dissemination system for experienced teachers (Smith, 22)
      h. Only some centers should disseminate to keep centers primarily service-oriented (Tanner, 24)

i. Each center should do some disseminating but remain primarily service-oriented (Tanner and Denemark, 25)
j. R&D disseminator (Task Force, 26)
k. Dissemination of training information and materials (teachers as reported by Woodruff, 35)
l. Need centers which accumulate, rework, and distribute information about new programs to schools through weekly newsletter which focuses on one or a few practices (Topp, 30)
m. Educational Service District disseminates protocol and training materials (Cohen, 5)

4. Inservice Teacher Education
   a. In-service programs (Scruggs, 18; Tanner and Denemark, 25; Bill Smith, 22; Task Force, 26; teachers surveyed by Woodruff, 35)
   b. In-service training should focus on skill development or refinement (Tanner, 24; Scruggs, 18; Tanner and Denemark, 25)
   c. Service centers for in-service training (Conference, 4)
   d. Prepare personnel to implement innovations in staffing, curriculum, media, and materials (Scruggs, 18)
   e. Training associated with particular areas or populations, i.e., reading, handicapped, drug abuse (Scruggs, 18; Tanner and Denemark, 25)
   f. Training for beginning teachers (Scruggs, 18; Rosner, 15; Cohen, 5; Tanner and Denemark, 25)
5. Education of other personnel
   a. Train aides and train teachers to work with them (Scruggs, 18)
   b. Train paraprofessionals (Rosner, 15)
   c. Train parents and older students to supplement staff (Scruggs, 18; Tanner and Denemark, 25)
   d. Train administrative, supervisory, and ancillary personnel (Scruggs, 18; Tanner and Denemark, 25)
   e. Broad trainee population (Ad Hoc Committee, 2)
   f. Center should serve only non-supervisory personnel involved in instructional/learning process (Seldon and Darland, 20)
6. Preservice Teacher Education
   a. Cooperate with colleges and universities in preservice preparation (Scruggs, 18)
   b. Train preservice teachers (Rosner, 15; Task Force, 26; teachers reported by Woodruff, 35)
   c. Provide service centers for preservice training (Conference, 4)
7. Cooperation
   a. Locus for community action programs (Cohen, 5)
   b. Vehicle for collaboration and efficiency in using new uncoordinated resources (Tanner, 24)
   c. Mechanism to get Federal, state, and local in-service programs to cooperate (Consortia, 6)
   d. Inter-institutional delivery mechanism (Schmieder, 17)
8. Children's education
   a. Maintain exemplary program for children (Rosner, 15)
   b. Identify behavioral and instructional needs of children (Consortia, 6)
   c. Raise performance of school children from low-income, rural and urban families (Task Force, 26)
   d. Provide individualized instruction for children (Williams, 34)
   e. Upgrade educational performance (Shanker, 21)

9. Performance-based teacher education
    a. LEA must be committed to significance of measurable objectives and performance-based criteria and to principle of accountability (CSSO, 32)
    b. Delivery system for performance-based teacher education (Smith, 22)
    c. Instruct for development and demonstration of competencies (Schalock, 16)
    d. Bring about demonstrable increase in competence (Ad Hoc Committee, 2)
    e. Provide competency-based teacher education programs in which teachers can acquire techniques (Williams, 34)
10. Research
    a. Research component (teachers reported by Woodruff, 35)
    b. Research services (Cohen, 5)
    c. Some money for R&D, but one or two ccoperatives in the state should do most of it (Schalock, 16)
11. Educational Service District should place teachers (Cohen, 5)
12. Educational Service District should recruit paraprofessionals (Cohen, 5)
13. Evaluation component (Task Force, 26; Schalock, 16)
14. Serve performance-based certification needs of state agencies (Rosner, 15)
15. Grant credit for in-service work (teachers reported by Woodruff, 35)
16. Help local school district serving substantial numbers of children from low-income families to help themselves (Davies, 7)
17. State teacher center would train state personnel to assist local renewal sites (Task Force, 26)
18. Some centers should refer school personnel to other agencies, but not all--should stay mainly service-oriented (Tanner, 24; Tanner and Denemark, 25)
19. Attack specific school problems in specific geographic site with concentration of Federal monies (Marsh, 12)
20. Education renewal site concerned with fiscal changes (Tanner and Denemark, 25; Scruggs, 18)

IV. CLIENTELE OF A TEACHER CENTER
  A. Teacher center should serve other personnel besides teachers
    1. Educate parents and older students to play supplementary roles (Tanner and Denemark, 25)
    2. Problem specific training of administrative, supervisory, and ancillary personnel (Tanner and Denemark, 25; and teachers reported by Woodruff 35)
    3. Train personnel involved in instructional/learning process but leave out administration; the latter have too much free time to carry out their wishes and are too assertive to be assimilated: (Seldon and Darland, 20)
    4. Paraprofessionals (Cohen, 5; Rosner, 15; and teachers reported by Woodruff, 35)
    5. Adult education, training of parents (teachers reported by Woodruff, 35)
    6. Change agents (teachers reported by Woodruff, 35)

7. Board of education members (teachers reported by Woodruff, 35)
8. Professors (teachers reported by Woodruff, 35)
9. To affect interrelationship, training must be directed at all school personnel (Tanner, 24)
10. Children from low-income families (CSSO, 32; Task Force, 26; Welch, 33)
11. See also listings under "What Are the Functions of a Teacher Center?": In-Service Teacher Education, Preservice Teacher Education, and Education of Other Personnel

V. PARITY--OR THE LACK OF IT
   A. Reasons behind pro-parity positions
      1. Universities too theoretical and schools too poor to train teachers alone--need to cooperate. In addition, community agencies and members are responsive and not dominated by any one component (Ad Hoc Committee, 2)
      2. Advantages of Parity (Ad Hoc Committee, 2)
         a. Variety of staff
         b. Variety of training models
         c. Singleness of purpose
         d. Merge theoretical and practical
         e. No one group dominates, all have say
      3. Principles of partnership (Consortia, 6)
         a. Legitimate route for injection of new ideas from each party
         b. Each partner responsible for his peculiar domain
         c. Organizational structures that can withstand personnel transitions
         d. Checks and balances to prevent one partner from taking over
         e. Structure should grow gradually
         f. Executive duties should be described
      4. General benefits of a consortia (Consortia, 6)
         a. Provides economic support through shared tasks and resources
         b. Is a reviewing matrix for persons and goals
         c. Fills needs for sharing social adaptation
         d. Provides curriculum renewal; faculty re-orientation; and vehicle for instruction, training, and education
         e. Broadly services students needs
         f. Can use special services on cost-effectiveness basis
         g. Increases probability of institutional accountability
         h. Furthers institutional growth and diversity
         j. Works on basis of human and institutional parity
      5. Levers of influence in teacher education (Rosner, 14)
         a. Schools
            1) School curriculum contributes to teacher education curriculum
            2) Organizational structures contribute to definition of staffing patterns and personnel roles
         b. Community
            1) Statements of educational goals
            2) Financial support
         c. Government agencies--local, state, federal
            1) Financial support
            2) Accreditation
            3) Certification

d. University
    1) Governance of institution
    2) Admission practices
    3) Reward structure for teaching
    4) Scholarship
    5) Research and public services of faculty
    6) Degree requirements
e. Professional associations
    1) Subject matter associations influence content of school and university curriculum
    2) Teacher associations influence staff utilization, conditions of employment, compensation

B. Details and recommendations regarding parity governance of teacher centers
1. The board should represent the "total environment." That means not only all concerned groups but also members of those groups who are militant as well as middle-of-the road. Board representatives from the schools and universities will be more sensitive to local interests when they are from the same ethnic groups as those in the community (Futchs, 9)
2. Community board members should be trained in the educational process in a manner that doesn't reduce cooperative spirit. (One project provided for leadership training for officers of advisory board who, in turn, conducted seminars for all types of board members) (Futchs, 9)
3. The administration of funds should be such that no one group controls the purse strings. Alternatives to the latter are channeling funds to the board, specifying budget items in the proposal, and including community members in proposal writing (Futchs, 9)
4. The development of the board should be gradual and logical: community, university, school, and state officials should study together cultural pluralism, shared responsibility on a committee, and the nature of the educational process. They should then write the proposal--with the community members on more equal footing because of the above (Futchs, 9)
5. The roles of all--community, university, local,and state education agencies--should be clearly defined, often in greater detail than that provided by project directors' handbooks (Futchs, 9)
6. Governing board should have outside coordinator rather that one from constituent groups (teachers reported by Woodruff, 35)
7. Client- rather than university-centered (needs university resources and personnel but complex needs to be free from it in its operations and responses (teachers reported by Woodruff, 35)
8. Cooperation (Stewart, 23)
    a. Cooperation between city schools and university will vary with the city
    b. City schools have different institutional structures that inhibit or promote collaboration
        1) They vary in their relations with teacher organizations
        2) They vary in where they're at in decentralizing
9. Parity--interpretation differs from city to city (Stewart, 23)
    a. In most communities, it means review of plan by community representatives
    b. In some, however, it means participation in writing

10. Schalock (16), in his paper, lists benefits and costs to the following groups:
    a. Schools
    b. Community
    c. College or university
    d. State department of education
    e. Education students
    f. Pupils
    g. Professional associations and unions
    h. USOE
11. Parity includes the rights of the learner to evaluate the professor (Heffernan-Cabrera, 10)
12. Parity is a parity of accomodation of emerging philosophies and contemporary life styles (Heffernan-Cabrera, 10)
13. USOE position (may or may not be read as parity)
    a. School officials, parents, community leaders as members of Educational Renewal Councils will work on needs assessment, program planning, implementation, and evaluation (Davies, 7)
    b. LEA should demonstrate a willingness to structure the project on parity-involved needs assessment (CSSO, 32)
    c. LEA to develop Educational Renewal Council to provide direction, within framework of state and local school boards, in needs assessment, planning, implementation, and evaluation. Council representative of school community including, for example, staff of participating schools and universities, parents. Final authority and responsibility for the operation of the project funded rests with local school board (CSSO, 32)
14. Means of establishing relationships (Scruggs, 18)
    a. Cooperative assessment of needs
    b. Faculty members from schools and universities could team teach at teacher centers
    c. In-service teachers engaged in planning at center could have facilities and staff of school of education open to them
    d. Someone from school of education on supervisory staff of center
    e. Supervisors from school could be given academic rank in school of education
15. Three conditions for developing parity (Reickhart, 13)
    a. Participants believe effective inquiry into educational problems requires parity situation
    b. Trust and mutual respect for contributions of each participant
    c. Mechanisms for building trusts and respect must be used

C. Reasons for including institutions of higher education in parity relationship
    1. Provide theoretical context in which to interpret teacher experience (Scruggs, 18; Tanner and Denemark, 25)
    2. Develop broad value patterns in teachers which are supportive of change (Scruggs, 18)
    3. Relate university-based research to field practices of establishing relationships (Scruggs, 18; Tanner and Denemark, 25)
    4. Provide technical leadership (Heffernan-Cabrera, 10)
    5. Take advantage of college supervisors' knowledge and experience (Topp, 30)

D. Pro-teacher positions
    1. Observations by Seldon and Darland (19)
        a. Reform cannot be imposed on teachers
        b. Teacher control of center cannot be overemphasized (Shanker agrees)

c. Teacher center should allow them to discover need for improvement, define problems, and seek solutions in non-threatening atmosphere

2. Scheme for governing sites and teacher centers, suggested by Seldon and Darland (19)
   a. Position that USOE should take
      1) Exclusive bargaining agents for teachers be given parity with local and state education agencies
      2) If no exclusive bargaining agent, teachers elect policy group
      3) Teacher center to be an independent corporation
      4) Teacher center should be under policy board of 9 people (see amendment under 3)
         a) 5 full-time teachers
         b) 2 specialists or principals
         c) 2 parents
         d) Bargaining agent or teachers' policy group should select teachers and jointly select with board of education the other 4 members
      5) USOE should provide liaison between all teacher centers
      6) USOE should provide 75% of funds for teacher center
   b. Position that state education agency should take
      1) Establish criteria for site selection on basis of federal regulations and needs as seen by state teachers' groups and others
      2) Supervise development of all governance machinery of teacher center as an independent corporation
      3) Be liaison to teacher center
      4) Assist with needs assessment, program development, and evaluation
      5) Audit all accounts
      6) Prepare annual report
   c. Position that local education agency should take
      1) Local education agency and teacher center policy board should coordinate activities of teacher center and renewal site
      2) Provide administrative services in accounting and facility management
   d. Position that policy board of teacher center should take
      1) Assisted by USOE, SEA, and LEA
      2) Needs assessment of personnel and programs
      3) Program evaluation
      4) Advisory student group
      5) Select full-time director and other administrative personnel
      6) Approve program, establish priorities
      7) Select facilities, equipment, materials, location of center
      8) Approve budget expenditure for center
      9) Approve use of ad hoc groups and experts
      10) Develop annual report
      11) Board appointees should have staggered terms, be unpaid, and be given appropriate leave with pay to accept the position

e. Higher education not involved in governance of teacher center

3. In a later version Darland and Seldon's paper (20), they specifically recommend that no administrative personnel be included in the center. In addition, teachers or their bargaining agent would choose all board members; paraprofessionals should be included on board but the inclusion of other school personnel would vary from school to school.
4. Teachers interviewed by Woodruff are also pro-teacher (35)
   a. Teachers want control of training complex
   b. See NEA and AFT as their power brokers
   c. Prior to funding, they want guarantee of their part in partnership
   d. Shouldn't violate collective bargaining agreements
   e. University, schools, professional associations for teachers, and community on board, but teachers should have 51 percent control

E. Setting
   1. Rationale for using community and schools as locus rather than neutral ground (Schalock, 16)
      a. Governmental units with funds
      b. Care about well-being of schools
      c. Control what happens in the schools
      d. Politically and economically supported institutions
      e. Human resources
      f. They benefit most from a cooperative
      g. Need training throughout state, and school is the vehicle
   2. Neutral ground preferable (Ad Hoc Committee, 2; and teachers interviewed by Woodruff, 35).

F. Can parity boomerang and prevent change by participants trading off interests? (question raised at conference co-sponsored by Task Force and LTI, 4)

VI. USOE MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL RENEWAL

A. USOE version (Davies, 7)

1. NIE will provide information, resources, training, and assistance to centers
2. Management will mainly be in new National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (NCIES) (based on old BEPD)
3. Included in NCIES are other BEPD programs, drop-out prevention program, bilingual education program, and part of Title III (ESEA)
4. Sites to be coordinated by State Renewal Centers, each with a resource center
5. Further coordination will come from the National Center for Educational Communication, National Center for Educational Technology, and National Center for Statistics
6. Support in specialized areas from Teacher Corps and programs in career education, drug education, health and nutrition, and environmental education

B. Exceptions taken by the U.S. Senate in an amendment to the education act, February 28, 1972 (Welch, 33; and Congressional Record, 31)

1. Led by Sen. Claiborne Pell, Chairman of Educational Subcommittee of Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Amendment introduced by Sen. Cranston
2. Commissioner of Education changing educational programs authorized by law in a manner inconsistent with the intent of Congress
   a. Consolidating into renewal program teacher training institutes under EPDA, drop-out prevention program, and federal share of Title III of EPDA
   b. Additionally three bureaus of USOE were disrupted and reorganized
3. Commissioner did not have rights to funds from drop-out prevention and bi-lingual programs as they are not discretionary
4. Commissioner did not consult with Congress
5. Amendment (added to Senate version of education act)
   a. Authorize funds for educational renewal from the following:
      1) Section 306 of the EPDA Act of 1965
      2) Part D of the Higher Education Act of 1965
      3) Section 402(c) of the General Education Programs Act
   b. Provide legislative authority for Right To Read, so funds would not be taken from Upward Bound
   c. Restore USOE to its former structure until further legislation
   d. Prohibit unauthorized program consolidations and meddling with provisions of authorized legislation
   e. Give increased status to bilingual education program to preserve its integrity

VII. STAFFING A TEACHER CENTER

A. David Marsh(12) asks several questions about staffing a center

1. What should be the composition of teacher center staffs? (Includes their roles, selection, size, and status)
2. What training is likely to be needed by a center's staff? (Includes the question of their credentialling)
3. How can staff commitment to purposes of a teacher center be maintained?

B. As described in Appendix B of the "Rosner Report" (8)

1. Uses personnel from variety of backgrounds, not necessarily with credentials required by participating institutions

C. As seen by the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Training Complexes (2)
   1. Staff from a wide variety from schools, community, university

D. As envisioned by Saul Cohen
   1. Training Staff
      a. School and College faculty
         1) Part-time
         2) 2-year leaves of absence
      b. Part-time faculty from industry and community
   2. Pupils
      a. Schoolroom youngsters
         1) After School
         2) Summer
      b. School dropouts
      c. Adults without schooling
      d. Other trainees (for special purposes)

E. Rosner has narrower view of staff (15)
   1. University faculty employed in the university and the school
      a. Functions of university faculty at school
         1) Help design exemplary curriculum
         2) Train cooperating teachers
         3) Set up TV for evaluation purposes
         4) Develop professional library and curriculum materials center
      b. After performing training functions, they leave--they're change agents who change schools into training centers

VIII. FINANCING TEACHER CENTERS

A. Questions on financing teacher centers, raised by David Marsh (12)
   1. How could current resources be redirected (from schools, universities, professional associations, teachers themselves, and state departments of education)? Are there prospects for legislative support of teacher centers?
   2. How would coordination of resources by handled?
   3. What federal funds would be available for teacher centers?
   4. What are anticipated costs of a teacher center?

B. Rationale for cost sharing, provided by H. Del Schalock (16)
   1. Colleges have budgets for teacher education
   2. Schools have budgets for in-service teacher education
   3. School districts and colleges have already pooled financial and human resources
      (for information, write Dr. Jim Ellingson, Oregon Board of Education, Salem; or Dr. Bill Drummond, Washington State Department of Education, Olympia)
   4. State monies for program evaluation and in-state diffusion
   5. Federal monies for R&D

C. Position of USOE on financing teacher centers
   1. Concentrate Federal discretionary monies in the nation's neediest schools (Davies, 7; Task Force, 26)
   2. According to DHEW instructions to all chief state school officers, Jan. 14, 1972 (32):
      a. The LEA has to show a large enough concentration of federal, state, local, and other resources to have a chance of project effectiveness

b. Federal funds will supplement, not supplant, non-federal funds normally available
c. Renewal must be assimilated after an agreed upon phase-out of federal support

3. According to James Welch in a magazine article, February 1972 (33):
   a. Money consolidated by USOE from a number of existing programs including
      1) Title III, ESEA
      2) Staff upgrading sections of EPDA
      3) Bits of Cooperative Research program
      4) Drop-out prevention program
      5) Bi-lingual education program
   b. Each state would get funds for state renewal center
   c. Approved sites would be funded for a 5-year period with an average annual grant of about $750,000. (Task Force '72 report of January 13, 1972 (26) refers to 5-year phased input of federal funds with phase-out after fifth year)
   d. Initial OE projections down in recent weeks to a 1972-73 budget of $85 million for fewer than 100 renewal sites
4. According to Seldon and Darland (19)
   a. First year budget is $150 million for one million children
   b. By 1986, 5-1/2 times increase

D. The position of the Senate on February 28, 1972 when it passed on amendment to the Senate version of the education act (31)
   1. Funds from the drop-out prevention program and bi-lingual program may not be used for teacher centers without the consent of Congress since they are not discretionary funds
   2. USOE will be allowed to use funds from the following
      a. Section 306 of the EPDA Act of 1965
      b. Part D of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (EPDA)
      c. Section 402(c) of the General Education Provisions Act

E. The position of Seldon and Darland
   1. From a draft version of their paper (19)
      a. 5 years full financing by federal government
      b. 5 more years phasing into federal-state, 50-50 sharing
      c. Local finance should not be used: innovation not popular with local tax groups
   2. From a later version of their paper (20)
      a. Federal government should undertake a massive support program without phase-out
      b. Control of expenditures should be by the Board of Directors of the non-profit teacher center (Board consists of representatives selected by teachers and/or enough teachers to constitute a voting majority)
      c. Cannot operate much of a teacher center for under $250,000 a year

F. The opinion of 18 teachers from different parts of the country as related by Phillip Woodruff in a report for LTI, April 1971 (35)
   1. Teacher center should absorb the funds of all those in an area engaged in training and replace their training roles
   2. Should be funded for more than one year

G. Federal funds for networks should come from more than one bureau in

USOE (Schalock, 16)
1. BEPD and Experimental Schools Program share in development and diffusion costs
2. NCERD--research costs

H. Cost of 12 functional and structural pilots (Rosner, 15)
1. $12 million first year
2. $18 million second year

I. Cost per complex (Rosner, 15)
1. First year--$1,500,000
   a. $750,000 for 30 staff
   b. $750,000 for 150 trainees @5000
2. Additional years (cost for all complexes)
   a. $450 million second year
   b. $1.35 billion third year
   c. $3 billion fourth year
   d. $4.5 billion fifth year
   e. By fifth year, including cost of college preparation, cost of of teacher education would be $6 billion ($3.5 of which on beginning teachers)

J. Example of teacher renewal financing in Georgia apparently based on available funds (34)
1. School makes annual contribution to service centers based on the number of teachers
2. Cooperating graduate schools all have same tuition, part of which is retained by the service center (tuition paid by teacher, school system, or shared services center)
3. Major cost of credit and non-credit program carried by institution. In 1970-71, budgeted $3-1/2 million, of which $600,000 received through tuition

IX. Numbers of teacher centers--present and future
A. In 1972-73,50-70 school districts will have renewal cites with a minimum of one in each state (Davies, February 1972, 7)
B. Goal by 1986 is for sites to serve 10,000 schools with 5-1/2 million disadvantaged children (Davies, February 1972, 7)
C. Welch refers to USOE projections for 1972-73 having dropped to 100 renewal sites (33, article written before February)
D. Cohen (5) envisions a five-year plan
1. Five-year Plan
   a. First year--100 complexes
      1) Linked to 10 largest metropolitan areas
      2) Train 20% of new teachers
   b. Second year--400 complexes
      1) 300 in 10 metropolitan areas
      2) 100 pilots in rural and small- and medium-sized city population areas
   c. Third year--900 complexes
      1) 600 in 10 metropolitan areas (completes that network)
      2) 200 in rural and small- and medium-sized city population areas
   d. Fourth year--2000 complexes
   e. Fifth year--3000 complexes
2. Prior to start of five-year program,two years to recruit train staff, experiment with materials, and develop original framework
3. Training Complex size: 400,000 people accomodated each year

a. About 100-175 trainees per complex, ideally
b. 3000 complexes--one for each college or university

E. List of 1971-72 teacher centers proveded by Task Force 72 (27)

1. Oakland Unified School District
Oakland, California 94606
Director: Marcus Foster

2. The Texas Education Agency*
West Texas State University
Canyon, Texas 79015
Director: Emmitt D. Smith,
Vice-President for Research
and Development
* see F for listing of all
Texas teacher centers

3. University of Rhode Island
Department of Education
Kingston, Rhode Island 02881
Director to be named

4. Washington, D.C., Public Schools
D.C. Public Schools
Washington, D.C. 20005
Director: Hugh Scott, Super.

5. Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28607
Director: Kenneth England

6. Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts 01510
Director: Irving A. Schwartz
subcontract of Clark:
Institute of Behavioral Research
2429 Linden Lane
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
Director: Harold Cohen

7. SUNY at Stony Brook
Stony Brook New York 11790
Director: Mortimer Kreuter

8. West Virginia University
College of Human Resources and
Education
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506
(also referred to as Northern
Appalachian Training Center for
Teachers in the Technologies)
Director: Paul DeVore

9. Berkeley Unified School District
University of California, Berkeley
Tolman Hall, School of Education
Berkeley, California 94720
(also called Center for Training in the
Emotional Aspects of Learning)
Director: Eli Bower

10. Oakland Public Schools
Far West Regional Laboratory for
Educational Research and Development
Hotel Claremont, 1 Garden Circle
Berkeley, California 94705
Director: Ned Flanders

11. Cleveland Public Schools
1380 East 6th Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Director: James Tanner

12. Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, New York 10027
Director: Bruce Joyce

13. Florida State University
Department of Elementary Education
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Director: Norman R. Dodl

14. Louisville Public Schools
Brown Educational Center
4th and Broadway, Room 1114
Louisville, Kentucky 40202
Director: Joseph Atkins

15. Michigan State University
School of Education
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Director: J. Bruce Burke

16. Oregon State System of Higher
Education
Monmonth, Oregon 97361
Director: David Marsh

17. Portland State University
Portland, Oregon 97207
Director: William A. Jenkins,
Dean of Education

18. Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York 13210
Director: James Collins

19. University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601
Director: Gilbert Shearron

20. University of Houston
College of Education
Houston, Texas 77004
Director: Robert Houston

21. University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
Director: Horace Reed

22. University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213
Director: Charles Gorman

23. University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio 43606
Director: George E. Dickson
Dean, College of Education

24. University of Wisconsin
734 University Avenue
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Director: Vere DeVault

F. List of Texas teacher centers (29)
1. Texas Teacher Center Project has two components
a. Texas Performance-Based Teacher Education
1) Begun July 1970 under USOE Training of Teacher Trainers (TTT) program
2) Structure was state coordinating unit, national coordinating unit (AACTE), and four teacher centers
a) AACTE will gather and disseminate results
b) AACTE will serve as clearinghouse for information on research and state of the art
3) In 1971, 4 centers expanded to 11
a) University of Houston Teacher Center (listed above)
i) University of Houston College of Education
ii) University of Houston College of Arts and Science
iii) Houston Independent School District
iv) Region IV Education Service Center
v) Houston Teachers Association
b) Texas Christian University Teacher Center, Fort Worth
i) Texas Christian University
ii) Fort Worth Independent School District
iii) Region XI Education Service Center
iv) EDPA Consortium D
v) Bishop College
vi) Teacher Corps team leaders
vii) Central Cities Educational Development Center
viii) Community Advisory Review Council
c) West Texas State University Teacher Center (listed above)
i) Regional XVI Education Service Center
ii) Amarillo and Canyon independent school districts
iii) West Texas State University
d) University of Texas at El Paso Teacher Center
i) University of Texas at El Paso
ii) El Paso and Ysleta independent school districts
iii) Region XIX Education Service Center
e) Dallas Teacher Center

i) Dallas Independent School District
ii) Southern Methodist University
iii) North Texas State University
iv) Texas Women's University
v) East Texas State University
vi) Dallas Baptist College
vii) Bishop College

f. New Centers--all having one education service center, one or more teacher education institutions, and one or more public schools
i) Bishop College, Dallas
ii) Dallas Baptist College
iii) Austin College
iv) Jarvis Christian College, Hawkins, Wood County
v) Prairie View A&M College, Prairie View, Waller County
vi) Somewhere in Austin (!)

b. Texas Educational Renewal Center (TERC)
1) Begun in 1971
2) One of four pilot teacher center projects funded by BEPD

2. Coordinator of the Texas Performance-Based Teacher Education and TERC is Texas Education Agency, Austin
3. Develop and field test models which are teacher centers and performance-based
4. Steering and advisory groups
a. Coordinators of the 6 EPDA consortia in Texas
b. Directors of teacher centers
c. State commissioner of higher education
d. Governor's staff
e. Executive secretaries of Texas State Teachers Association
f. Texas Classroom Teachers Association
g. Texas Association of School Administrators
h. Representatives from liberal arts
5. Texas Teacher Center Project to reach 20-25 centers by 1975.

X. THE EDUCATIONAL EXTENSION AGENT

A. Pilot State Dissemination Project
   1. Purpose: institutionalize educational field agent in schools (11-A)
   2. Agent system pilot-tested in 1970 in South Carolina, Utah, and Oregon (12-C)
   3. Employs three types of people (12-C)
      a. Field agents
      b. Retrieval staff members
      c. Project director

B. Rationale
   1. Help educators and school boards benefit from successful programs and practices developed elsewhere (12-C)
   2. Educators rely upon interpersonal communication to learn of new developments (12-C)
   3. Extension system provides interpersonal linkage (12-C)
   4. Component of renewal strategy (12-C)

C. Models of extension agents
   1. Agricultural extension agent
      a. USOE likens educational agent to agricultural agent (11-A, 7)
      b. However, structural differences between two types of agents (11-A)
         1) Agricultural agent works with autonomous, individual farmers--educational agent works with individuals in complex organization and must deal with power structures
         2) Agricultural agent pushes innovations in farming techniques--educational agent identifies needs of educators and locates helpful materials
         3) Agricultural agent is in direct contact with research source--educational agent is not and therefore may have difficulty using or interpreting research results
         4) Agricultural agent has clientele economically motivated to accept best practices--educational agent does not deal with individuals economically motivated to accept best practices
         5) Results of agricultural agent's work visible--educational agent's product is not visible as there is no consensus about the worth of specific educational practices
   2. Organizational change agent (11-A)
      a. Organizational change agent has been studied on basis of whether an insider or outsider--educational agent is a little of both (insider since he is permanent in school district, outsider since he is not attached to one school)
      b. Organizational change agent regarded as expert and has been given specific task--neither is true for educational agent
      c. Organizational change agent has access to informal network in school--educational agent does not
   3. Knowledge utilization specialist team and leader (9-B)
      a. Link knowledge resources with school administrators, teacher educators, and local educational agencies
      b. Relationship with client is permanent on regional basis
      c. Role
         1) Generate awareness of knowledge resources, communication channels, and client needs
         2) Translate awareness into action

d. Functions and description of team members
    1) Visit local schools and teacher educators routinely
    2) Call on them also when problems arise
    3) Have complete knowledge of educational resources through team leader and be able to assist in applications of knowledge
    4) Have knowledge of power structure and operation of client
    5) Have one year of training specifically as team member
e. Functions and description of team leader
    1) Member of state department of education
    2) Coordinates activities of team and links team members to resources
    3) Needs training in human interaction and process of change
    4) Needs knowledge of current curricular, instructional, and organizational matters
    5) Needs knowledge of state, local, federal, and other educational agencies
    6) Needs two years of training as team leader
f. Sponsored by and housed in state department of education
g. Ten-member team could serve 20-30 client systems
h. Each team member consults with leader and perhaps other team members when implementing an innovation

4. Teacher trainers as knowledge linkers (9-B)
    a. Role
        1) Liaisons between knowledge resources and teachers
        2) Give support to teachers adopting new materials or methods
        3) Assist teachers in diagnosis of classroom needs
    b. Permanent, regional service
    c. Operate out of state department of education which coordinates their activities
    d. Eighteen-month training
    e. Publicizing teacher trainers
        1) Use American Federation of Teachers or National Education Association
        2) Above could hold periodic seminars to inform teachers of trainers' roles and solicit opinions of teachers
5. Research utilization specialist (9-B)
    a. Helps school-community system to adapt and adopt knowledge and innovations
        1) School-community system may include the following individuals
            a) City government manager
            b) Police officer
            c) Members of school central office such as social worker, psychologist, curriculum director, and guidance personnel
            d) School principal
            e) Teachers
            f) Students
        2) School-community system should volunteer to have agent
    b. Acts initially as a catalyst: assists clients in self-examination
    c. Links clients to resources using ERIC and others
    d. Helps organize and reformulate knowledge
    e. Should eventually serve as knowledge-linker only
    f. Should hold regular job while being an agent
    g. Requires two weeks of intensive training, then one year of in-service training

D. Functions
   1. USOE says agent should serve as personal linkage between individuals wishing to receive information and sources of information (11-A)
   2. Help educators define their problems (12-C)
   3. Find appropriate information or refer clients to other resources (12-C)
   4. Provide feedback to resources about obstacles and aids to adoption (12-C, 4)
   5. Specific recommendations lacking in pilot state proposals (11-A)
      a. Degree of directiveness in helping client define problem
      b. Level at which agent works in school system
      c. Involvement in planning and implementing innovations
   6. In pilot programs, the intensive agent-client relationship specified sometimes inconsistent with the large number of schools served (11-A)
   7. Should agent diagnose needs? (11-A)
      a. In some pilot programs, agents seen as diagnosers of needs
      b. In one program, field agent to accept teachers' stated needs and help them find solutions
      c. Problems with diagnosis role
         1) Field agents not trained in diagnosis
         2) Not mandated by school to diagnose
         3) Takes much time to diagnose
            a) In some pilot programs, never got to information services
            b) Speed of information service considered important--schools move from crisis to crisis
   8. Help client make his request specific, partially because of computer information retrieval costs

E. Publicizing and installing an educational field agent
   1. Time-consuming (from experience of pilot programs) (11-A)
   2. Avoid formal meetings in publicizing--teachers will not open up about needs (11-A)
   3. Small group visits better than letters and videotaped advertising (11-A)
   4. Avoid announcing agent has come to solve teachers' problems (11-A)
   5. Prior familiarity with individuals or school system helps understanding between clients and agent (11-A)
   6. Stress informational rather than diagnostic aspect of program--latter may antagonize and diverts attention from fact that teachers will be getting information (11-A)
   7. Important to gain initial acceptance from top administrators before proceding to lower levels (11-A)
   8. Field agents in pilot programs initially solicited most requests from clients who held positions similar to the ones they left (11-A)
   9. Skepticism in school personnel (11-A)
      a. Reluctance to get involved in more new programs of unproven worth
      b. Fear that state board is undermining local boards
      c. Sense that they already have too much rather than too little information
   10. Installation design must include provision for six conditions (9-B)
      a. Maintain and reinforce identity of change agents
      b. Establish security for role maintenance in terms of financial, psychological, social, and legal support
      c. Limit tasks and expectations to prevent overload or exploitation
      d. Establish freedom for agent to explore facets of role without premature interference
      e. Reward change agent and school

11. Arrangements for installation (9-B)
    a. Written contract with client
    b. Prepare school personnel with advance information and even training
    c. Build role maintenance team
        1) Discuss progress with and give advice to agent
        2) Composition of team
            a) Two colleagues of equal status
            b) One member of leadership status
            c) One outsider
    d. Establish role monitoring and adjustment mechanisms
    e. Place trainee agents in pairs or trios
    f. Establish role reference group through newsletters, reunions, and joint efforts
    g. Formal and specified procedure for evaluation

F. Relationship with intermediate organization (where agent is located)
    1. Organization may be university, state department of education, or local information service programs (9-B, 12-C) Extension office
    2. All agents will serve in specific geographic areas (12-C)
    3. Intermediate organization has great effect on stimulating requests to agents (11-A)
    4. Benefits of being attached to an organization (11-A)
        a. Legitimizes agent's role
        b. Increases awareness of needs
        c. Receives technical assistance for follow-up work
        d. Works in supportive, informal environment
    5. Tensions between organization and agent occurred in pilot programs over lack of definition of agent's role and conflicts with existing roles (latter more likely in an urban school system) (11-A)
    6. Field agent himself may enhance the reputation of the organization

G. Selection criteria
    1. USOE requires agent to live in target area (11-A)
    2. General traits as seen by Havelock (9-B)
        a. Personal traits such as persistence, high energy, and commitment to work
        b. Empathy with client and consumer groups he will be serving
        c. Credibility derived from previous work success and organization with which he is associated
        d. Higher education and literacy
        e. Gregarious--variety of experiences and roles--a "convention attender"
        f. Should be similar to clients in traits they value, whether that means being poor, black, Jewish, female, etc.
        g. Probably should not be a zealot for particular educational causes, philosophies, or products
        h. Prior to training, should already possess skills in human relations, communicating, and organizing

H. Financing educational extension personnel
    1. Initially five years of full federal funding (12-C)
    2. Financing should be responsibility of institution which trains agent (9-B)
    3. Eventual funding should be one-third federal, one-third state, and one-third local (4)
    4. In 1973 budget request of USOE for product identification and dissemination, $5 million earmarked for educational extension agent program (12-B)

5. Expect local schools to add agents and support them under local budgets (12-B)
6. Federal funds will also support retrieval and reference units in state departments of education (12-B)

I. Information Support (12-C)
   1. Information service for agents will be provided by the National Center for Educational Communication
   2. Information service units will be established within state education agencies
   3. Units will be supplied with information on instructional materials, programs, practices, and knowledge
   4. Retrieval staff members
      a. Will be located in state education agency or service agency
      b. Will assist field agent in specifying clients' requirements, using resources, and developing or synthesizing resources

J. Training of agents
   1. Responsibility of training program to install and support agents over time (9-B)
   2. Formal arrangements for qualifying and certifying agents to legitimize them (9-B)
   3. Contract for education of agents (12-C)
      a. Contract will be awarded in May 1972
      b. Contractor will provide information to plan and implement training
         1) Identify selection criteria
         2) Specify roles for agent
   4. Training should be preservice and continuing (12-C)
   5. Training of agents should take from one to two years (9-B)

K. Number of educational extension personnel
   1. About 85 educational extension agents will be hired through state education agencies in 1973 (12-B and 12-C)
   2. In 1970, pilot programs in South Carolina, Utah, and Oregon had the following number of personnel
      a. Seven extension agents
      b. Seven retrieval staff members
      c. Three project directors

L. State educational renewal coordinators (4)
   1. One per state plus one each for Guam, American Samoa, Wake Island, Trust Territories, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia
   2. Names, addresses, and phone numbers for coordinators in 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. "Action Conference on Educational Reform and Communication." Co-sponsored by Task Force '72 and Leadership Training Institute for Teacher Centers. January 26-27, 1971.

2. Ad Hoc National Committee on Training Complexes. Final Report of the Ad Hoc National Committee on Training Complexes. Worcester, Mass: Clark University, July 1970. ED 042 665.

3. Ad Hoc National Advisory Committee on Training Complexes. Inventory of Training Centers. Final Report. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University, Training Complex Project Administration Center, June 1970. ED 042 664.

4. "Background Statement of Educational Renewal." Based on the Conference of State Education Renewal Coordinators, December 12-14, 1971. (Report provided by Task Force '72.)

5. Cohen, Saul B. "A Five-Year Goal for Training Complexes," Appendix D of The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education by Benjamin Rosner and others. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, July 1971.

6. "Consortia: To Consort or Not To Consort?--That Is the Question" [Received 9/22/72, author unknown].

7. Davies, Don. "Plans and Priorities for '72." Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N.J., February 1972.

8. "Description of the Five Programs," Appendix B of The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education by Benjamin Rosner and others. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, July 1971.

9. Futchs, Mariya. Shared Responsibility: A Special Study on One Structural Feature of Teacher Centers. November 1971.

9-A. Havelock, Ronald G. A Guide to Innovation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, 1970. 281p. Available from Publications Division, Institute for Social Research, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor 48106.
ED 054 604. Not available from EDRS.

9-B. ---. Training for Change Agents. A Guide to the Design of Training Programs in Education and Other Fields. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1971. 219p.
ED 056 259. EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-$9.87.

9-C. ---, and Mary C. Havelock. Preparing Knowledge Linking Change Agents in Education. A Materials and Training Development Project. Final Report. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, October 1971. 90p.
ED 056 257. EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29.

10. Hefferman-Cabrera, Patricia. "Parity as a Philosophical Thrust in--and for--Educational Renewal" [1972].

11. Holowenzak, Stephen P. "Report: Towards the Development of a Poly-Cultural Training Complex Center." Paper prepared for the Connecticut Conference at the University of Bridgeport, May 15-16, 1971.

11-A. Louis, Karen Seashore, and Sam D. Sieber. Field Agents Role in Education. Part I, USOE Pilot State Dissemination Program. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, January 1972. 41p. ED 056 254. EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29.

12. Marsh, David. An Explication of Issues Surrounding Teacher Centers and Education Renewal Sites.

12-A. Metzger, Loya, and Sam D. Sieber. Problems in Information Retrieval--Materials from the USOE Pilot State Dissemination Program. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, September 1971. 44p. ED 056 245. EDRS Price: MF-$0.65; HC-$3.29.

12-B. Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Renewal, National Center for Educational Communication. "[Fiscal Year] 1973 Budget Request for Product Identification and Dissemination." February 1972.

12-C. ---. "Program Note on the Educational Extension Agent." February 1972.

13. Reichart, Sandford. "Parity: One View" [1972].

14. Rosner, Benjamin, and others. The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, July 1971.

15. Rosner, Benjamin. "Notes on a School-University Consortium for Teacher Education," Appendix F of The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education by Benjamin Rosner and others. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, July 1971.

16. Schalock, H. Del. "BEPD, NCERD, and Teacher Education that Makes a Demonstrable Difference," Appendix G of The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education by Benjamin Rosner and others. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, July 1971.

17. Schmieder, Allen. "BEPD Delivery System." Draft Version. May 6, 1971.

18. Scruggs, Charles. "The Focus of Teacher Centers." Working Paper, Draft II. December 14, 1971.

19. Seldon, David, and David Darland. "Teacher Centers--Who's in Charge?" Draft Version.

20. ---. "Teacher Centers--Who's in Charge?" Revised Version. January 1972.

21. Shanker, Albert. "The 'Teacher Center': A Major Educational Advance," The New York Times, December 26, 1971.

22. Smith, William. "Performance-Based Teacher Education: First Steps First."

23. Stewart, Charles E. "Facilitating Local Options and Coordination of Programs," Appendix H of The Power of Competency-Based Teacher Education by Benjamin Rosner and others. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, July 1971.

24. Tanner, James R. "The Focus of the Teacher Center." Working Draft. December 17, 1971.

25. ---, and George W. Denemark. "The Focus of the Teacher Center in an Educational Renewal Site." Draft IV. February 4, 1972.

26. Task Force '72 Final Report.

27. Task Force '72. "List of 1971-72 Teacher Centers."

28. Teacher Centers: A Brief History.

29. Texas Teacher Center Project: A Briefing for Tomorrow, 1971-74 [Brochure].

30. Topp, Robert F. "Nature of Renewal Sites." March 1, 1972.

31. U.S. Congressional Record-Senate, February 28, 1972. pp. S2710-32.

32. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. "Criteria To Be Met in Nomination of Local School Districts that May Be Invited To Develop Educational Renewal Sites." Sent to all chief state school officers on January 14, 1972.

33. Welch, James. "Renewal: The Latest Word," Educational Researcher, 1:10-11, 15; February 1972.

34. Williams, Joseph A. "Education Renewal--The Georgia Program for Continuing Education Personnel Development" [1972].

35. Woodruff, Phillip. "Preliminary Report for Teacher Improvement Leadership Institute (LTI) and USOE-Sponsored Conference of Teacher Leaders: Task Force '72 and the Classroom Teacher Look at Educational Reform." Draft Version. April 15, 1971.

ERIC DESCRIPTORS

To expand a bibliography using ERIC, descriptors or search terms are used. To use a descriptor: (1) Look up the descriptor in the SUBJECT INDEX of monthly, semi-annual, or annual issue of Research in Education (RIE). (2) Beneath the descriptors you will find title(s) of documents. Decide which title(s) you wish to pursue. (3) Note the "ED" number beside the title. (4) Look up the "ED" number in the "DOCUMENT RESUME SECTION" of the appropriate issue of RIE. With the number you will find a summary of the document and often the document's cost in microfiche and/or hardcopy. (5) Repeat the above procedure, if desired, for ohter issues of RIE and for other descriptors. (6) For information about how to order ERIC documents, turn to the back pages of RIE. (7) Indexes and annotations of journal articles can be found in Current Index to Journals in Education by following the same procedure. Periodical articles cannot be secured through ERIC.

TOPIC: *"Teacher Centers: An Outline of Current Information."*

DESCRIPTORS TO USE IN CONTINUING SEARCH OF RIE AND CIJE:

College School Cooperation
Consortia
Educational Coordination
Field Experience Programs
Interinstitutional Cooperation
School Community Relationship
Student Teachers
Student Teaching

ABOUT ERIC

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) forms a nationwide information system established by the U.S. Office of Education, designed to serve and advance American education. Its basic objective is to provide ideas and information on significant current documents (e.g., research reports, articles, theoretical papers, program descriptions, published and unpublished conference papers, newsletters, and curriculum guides or studies) and to publicize the availability of such documents. Central ERIC is the term given to the function of the U.S. Office of Education, which provides policy, coordination, training, funds, and general services to the 19 clearinghouses in the information system. Each clearinghouse focuses its activities on a separate subject-matter area; acquires, evaluates, abstracts, and indexes documents; processes many significant documents into the ERIC system; and publicizes available ideas and information to the education community through its own publications, those of Central ERIC, and other educational media.

TEACHER EDUCATION AND ERIC

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, established June 20, 1968, is sponsored by three professional groups--the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); the Association of Teacher Educators, a national affiliate of the National Education Association; and the Division of Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association. It is located at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

SCOPE OF CLEARINGHOUSE ACTIVITIES

Users of this guide are encouraged to send to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education documents related to its scope, a statement of which follows:

> *The Clearinghouse is responsible for research reports, curriculum descriptions, theoretical papers, addresses, and other materials relative to the preparation of school personnel (nursery, elementary, secondary, and supporting school personnel); the preparation and development of teacher educators; and the profession of teaching. The scope includes the preparation and continuing development of all instructional personnel, their functions and roles. While the major interest of the Clearinghouse is professional preparation and practice in America, it also is interested in international aspects of the field.*

The scope also guides the Clearinghouse's Advisory and Policy Council and staff in decision-making relative to the commissioning of monographs, bibliographies, and directories. The scope is a flexible guide in the idea and information needs of those concerned with pre- and inservice preparation of school personnel and the profession of teaching.

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education; Contract number OEC-0-8-080490-3706-(010). Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.